

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has amended the specification to correct several minor informalities. Further the specification has been amended to further describe the relative rotation between the hub and the wheel as shown by arrows 56 in Figure 8. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stoyka (US 5,552,759). Stoyka discloses a device for detecting removal of a wheel or hub cap to prevent theft. The Stoyka device includes a sensor mounted within a lug nut or on a wheel hub that actuates responsive to removal or partial removal of the wheel. The sensors disclosed in Stoyka detect a change in pressure or exposure to light that occurs as a lug nut is loosened and a wheel is moved away from a wheel hub. The Stoyka sensor cannot detect relative rotation between the wheel and the hub to which it is attached. The Stoyka device discloses only detection of the wheel being moved away from a wheel hub, such as occurs during removal of the wheel.

Amended claims 1, 13 require a sensor to selectively generate a signal indicative of relative rotation between the hub and the wheel. The wheel removal detection device disclosed in Stoyka detects only removal or partial removal of the wheel, not relative rotation as is required in claim 1 and 13. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15 and 17-19.

Claims 5, 12 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoyka (US 5,552,759). Claims 5 and 12 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore require a sensor to selectively generate a signal indicative of relative rotation between the hub and the wheel. Stoyka does not disclose or suggest this limitation.

Amended claim 20 requires detecting relative rotation between a wheel and a hub. Stoyka does not disclose or suggest detecting relative rotation between a wheel and a hub. Stoyka instead discloses only detecting removal of the wheel from a hub. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoyka in view of Williams et al (US 6,424,261). Claims 9 and 16 require a signal generator that includes a piezo-ceramic material. Claim 9 and 16 ultimately depend from an independent claim that requires a sensor to selectively generate a signal indicative of relative rotation between the wheel


and the hub. Accordingly, claims 9 and 16 depend from an allowable base claim and are therefore also in allowable condition.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoyka in view of Mantini et al (US 5,959,365). Claim 3 ultimately depends from claim 1 and requires a warning device for conveying information indicative of relative rotation between the wheel and the hub. The proposed modification of Stoyka in view of Mantini et al. does not disclose or suggest a signal indicative of relative rotation between the wheel and the hub. Stoyka discloses only a signal for detecting removal of a wheel. For this reason the proposed combination does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

All objections, and rejections having now been addressed, Applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**



John M. Siragusa

Registration No. 46,174

400 West Maple Road, Suite 350

Birmingham, Michigan 48009

Telephone: (248) 988-8360

Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: June 10, 2005